arXiv:quant-ph/0010115v1 31 Oct 2000

Essay Review
Classical Versus Quantum Ontology

P. Busch
Department of Mathematics, University of Hull
Electronic address: P.Busch@maths.hull.ac.uk

February 1, 2008

D. Home, *Conceptual Foundations of Quantum Physics: An Overview from Modern Perspectives* (New York: Plenum Press, 1997), xvii+386 pp., ISBN 0-306-45660-5.

"*The limits of my language* mean the limits of my world."
(Wittgenstein, Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus, Proposition 5.6.)

1 Short review

Quantum mechanics faces a strange dilemma. On the one hand it has long been claimed to be an irreducibly *statistical* theory, allowing the calculation of measurement outcome statistics while being unable to predict the behaviour of *individual* microphysical processes. On the other hand, quantum mechanics has been increasingly used, with stunning success in the past few decades, to gain experimental control over individual objects on an atomic scale. The old philosophical debates among physicists over the interpretation of quantum mechanics have thus reached a new stage where conceptual questions have obtained more precise formulations and former *Gedanken* experiments have been turned into actual experiments. This situation has given an enormous boost to research into the foundations of quantum mechanics, leading to a variety of promising approaches towards a satisfactory theoretical account of individual microphysical phenomena. It is not clear at present whether such an account requires a modification of the standard quantum formalism or whether it can be achieved within that formalism, on the basis of a consistent realist, individual interpretation.

D. Home's book is devoted to contributing towards a clarification of this question. It is evidently written by an inspired and established participant in the ongoing quest to understand quantum mechanics and its description of the physical world. The author openly admits to his own, Bohmian ontological, preference; but in no place does the book become dogmatic about this although

that preference determines the line of.reasoning through most chapters. It rather adheres to its motto, expressed beautifully in the following quotations, chosen as the opening and closing words: *'It is the customary fate of new truths to begin as heresies and to end as superstitions'* (p.ix), and: *'The point is not to pocket the truth but to chase it'* (p. 378) The aim of the book is 'to provide an overview of the present status of the foundational issues of nonrelativistic quantum mechanics. ... The *need* to go beyond the standard interpretation is a focal point of the book' (p. x). The book recommends itself, appropriately, as just that: an *overview* of conceptual issues in quantum mechanics, from a *physicist's* perspective. The physical jargon and the style of presentation of mathematics are those of a practising theoretical physicist; this will come easily to fellow physicists but may in places provide difficulties for philosophers or mathematically inclined readers.

The book focuses 'firmly on the conceptual aspects, details of an experimental or mathematical nature have been minimized wherever possible.' With foundations of quantum physics being a substantial interdisciplinary research field in its own right, it is impossible to give a comprehensive account in one single book; hence any author is bound and justified to make a choice of topics in accordance with his or her own expertise and preference. Home's choice of perspective is that of a critical comparison mainly of three modern approaches to solve central conceptual problems of quantum mechanics – the Bohmian causal approach, the decoherence models, and the spontaneous wave function collapse models. A distinguishing feature of the book is that this comparison is not so much concerned with the relative theoretical or philosophical merits and difficulties faced by these approaches, but that it focuses strongly on possible experimental discriminations between them, taking into account modern technological advances. Home's choice of topics (each one assigned a chapter) gives a fair reflection of the core of current interest in foundational issues of quantum mechanics: a review of the standard (Copenhagen) interpretation and the need to go beyond it; the quantum measurement paradox; the classical limit of quantum mechanics; quantum nonlocality; wave particle duality; quantum Zeno effect; causality in quantum mechanics; and a reappraisal of Einstein's critique of quantum mechanics. Each chapter starts with a superb nontechnical, deeply reflected introduction of its topic, continues with a lot of detailed, careful physical discussion, and concludes with an extensive, valuable bibliography. Home has done a good job in trying to make up for omissions by adding further relevant references. Overall, a list of more than 700 works is provided, albeit quite strictly chosen within the confines of the book's specific outlook. The index is arranged purely by authors; a separate subject index would have been helpful in view of the size of this volume.

The production quality of the book is acceptable, except for the display of mathematical formulas; these look very much as if they were produced by typewriters, and long formulas are especially hard to read. In addition, careful proofreading could have helped to avoid a number of misprints in the text and formulas. A curious example: on page 23, '...$g\,(t)$ is switched on and off successfully...' rather than 'successively'; and on page 247: 'particle ontogo-

nal approach' instead of 'particle ontological approach'. (Also, after several months of repeated study, the glue binding gave in, leaving me with two loosely connected parts of the book in my hands.)

Overall, I would recommend this book as a very valuable, up-to-date account of quantum foundations from the perspective of a physicist interested in possible experimental tests. It certainly provides a good graduate text for students of physics seeking a deeper understanding of quantum mechanics, as well as being a useful resource for researchers in the foundations and philosophy of modern physics. The book complements in an original way related recent publications on the foundations of quantum mechanics, such as the texts on "Bohmian" quantum mechanics by D. Bohm and B. Hiley (1993) and P. Holland (1993), or the "strictly instrumentalist" Quantum Theory text by A. Peres (Peres, 1993).

Readers keen to get to know the book may stop reading here and return, if they wish, to this review at a later stage. In the subsequent, more detailed survey of the contents, I will point to some related lines of research concerned with *structural* aspects of quantum mechanics which are not addressed in this book but awareness of which I believe is crucial for obtaining a wider perspective on some problems. This attempt to place the present book in a broader context is meant to illustrate the fact that in the study of the foundations of quantum physics we seem to be facing a diversity of research cultures which may benefit considerably from each other if they could be brought into closer communication. It is only fair to note that this point could be made with reference to any one of the books on foundations of quantum mechanics, so that my remarks should not be understood as criticisms of this particular book but rather as an illustration of the general situation within this community.

It goes without saying that the choice of comments and issues raised is again limited by a particular perspective, this time the reviewer's. If Home's perspective is that of a theoretical physicist with a detailed knowledge of the experimental side and a remarkable openness towards the philosophical side, then I might characterise my own outlook as that of someone trained as a theoretical physicist who ended up working 'somewhere' between theoretical physics and mathematical physics, while both of us seem driven by an understanding of physics as *natural philosophy,* or *experimental metaphysics*. To obtain a balanced overview of the foundations of quantum physics, it would indeed be desirable to complement and confront the views presented in the book and in this review with those of a true philosopher of physics, a professional mathematical physicist, and a real experimental physicist. For the time being, with a symposium of that kind outstanding for an indeterminate amount of time, I suggest that my deliberations be accepted as one reader's dialogue with this book.

2 Ontological position vs ontic indeterminacy

Chapter 1 starts with a brief outline of the quantum formalism and its *standard interpretation*. Home uses this term to refer to what he describes as the

common hypothesis of all versions of the so-called orthodox, or Copenhagen interpretation: the hypothesis that a 'wave function is considered to be a complete description of the quantum mechanical state of either an individual system or an ensemble of identically prepared systems' (p. 16). The completeness claim, according to Home, 'immediately implies accepting an inherently statistical description in the microphysical domain.' In the standard interpretation, the "wave function"[1] is a representation of all probabilistic knowledge about outcomes of possible measurements and as such is devoid of any ontological content: 'In other words in the standard interpretation, the formalism of quantum mechanics or the quantum algorithm does not reflect a well-defined underlying reality, but rather it constitutes only knowledge about the statistics of observed results' (p. 17). Accordingly, Home rejects Bohr's and Heisenberg's interpretations of the uncertainty relations to the extent that they go beyond the direct experimental meaning in terms of spreads of measurement statistics: it cannot be logically inferred from the uncertainty relation that individual atomic particles could not have possessed simultaneous definite values for noncommuting variables before any measurement.

These observations are made to indicate that there is scope for alternative interpretations of quantum mechanics which provide more of a realist account of phenomena in the domain of that theory. To substantiate this claim, Home reviews Bell's critical analysis of von Neumann's influential no-hidden-variables theorem as well as the Kochen-Specker theorem, to point out the *possibility* of contextual hidden variables. The *need* to go beyond standard quantum mechanics derives from the infamous quantum measurement problem, the classical limit puzzle, and the phenomenon of nonlocality, issues to which the next three chapters are devoted.

Among the standard interpretations, Home distinguishes those which regard the state vector either as a representation of an ensemble (of identically prepared systems) or of an individual system. It is the latter which needs to be contrasted with the realist interpretations. It is well known that an unknown quantum state cannot be uniquely determined in a single run of a measurement, and a simple argument is presented showing that any attempt to nevertheless achieve this by means of state cloning must fail. However, Home sketches an interesting proposal by Aharonov and Vaidman, known as *protective measurement*, according to which the direct measurement of a state on a *single* system is possible provided enough is known about that state so as to ensure that the state change due to the measurement is negligible. This would indeed demonstrate that some objective reality can be ascribed to the quantum state. In the simplest possible case, the proposal would reduce to the situation where the state φ is known and a von Neumann-Lűders measurement of a simple observable, with outcomes represented by the projections $P_\varphi = |\varphi\rangle\langle\varphi|$, $I - P_\varphi$, would lead with certainty to the result indicating φ. However, the protective measurement idea refers to situations where the state need not be known in full, while at the

[1] I use 'wave functions' in quotation marks in order to indicate that I regard it as part of an outdated terminology. The term 'state (vector)' would suggest itself as a more neutral expression that does not carry the connotation of a classical wave ontology.

same time the known puzzles of individual state determinations are claimed to be avoided. As Home makes repeated reference to protective measurements, it seems worthwhile to point out a potential weakness of the existing proposals that may restrict the validity of some of the implications suggested in the literature.

The core feature of the various proposed schemes of protective measurements is that for some quantum states, φ, (known to belong to a certain class determined by the measurement interaction applied) it is possible to obtain as a single reading the expectation value, $\langle\varphi|A\varphi\rangle$, of some observable A, *without* significantly changing the state. If such a protective measurement is carried out for a sufficiently large set of (noncommuting) observables $A, B, C, \ldots$, then the values obtained may suffice to infer what the state was – and the system would still be in that state. However, in these protective measurement schemes, no analysis has been made of the magnitude of inference errors involved: it is only shown that the *expected* outcome is $\langle\varphi|A\varphi\rangle$, but no estimate of a range of uncertainty has been given. In fact, in a model of a joint measurement of position Q and momentum P very similar to one of the protective measurement schemes, it has been shown that the realisation of the *protective conditions* entails that the likely error range for the joint values $\langle\varphi|P\varphi\rangle$, $\langle\varphi|Q\varphi\rangle$ is large compared to the corresponding variances of momentum and position in the state φ, respectively; hence a unique state inference is impossible (Busch, 1985; Busch *et al*, 1995, Sec. VI.3.2). It may be worth noting that the idea of measuring the expectation value of an observable on a single system was considered and critically examined in a rigorous spin chain measurement model as early as 1978 (Zapp, 1978).

Whatever the value of protective measurements may ultimately turn out to be, from a conceptual point of view the existence of von Neumann-Lűders measurements of a discrete observable is sufficient to warrant the objective reality of a pure quantum state as explained above. Apart from answering the question of the epistemological or ontological status of the quantum *state*, any interpretation of quantum mechanics will provide some rules which determine the *actual properties* of a system in a given state. Home proceeds with an outline of the Bohmian ontological model, the best (if not the only) elaborated nonstandard interpretation. In contrast to the standard interpretations, the Bohmian model ascribes reality to a particular physical quantity, the particle's position, in addition to the "wave function". Home argues in several places throughout the book for the necessity of distinguishing the kind of reality possessed by position from the kind of reality possessed by the wave function: position is what we as observers discern most directly, while the "wave function" makes itself felt rather more indirectly, in its role as "pilot wave" guiding the particle's motion. The ontological priority of position over the "wave function" must be assumed, according to Home, if the Bohmian model is to address adequately the measurement problem and the classical limit problem. In line with this claim, Home maintains that since within the standard approaches the "wave function" has a solely epistemic – probabilistic – function, it cannot provide an appropriate account of the emergence of a definite, ontic (pointer) position of a macroscopic

object as we know it within the realm of classical physics.

However, the examples with which Home tries to illustrate the possible superiority of the Bohmian over the standard interpretation are not entirely conclusive (as he concedes). It is quite evident that the Bohm model allows one easily to formalise barrier transmission and reflection times, or to describe elementary particle trajectories as they are assumed in the theoretical deduction of CP violation in kaon decay. Such concepts are notoriously difficult to incorporate into quantum mechanics. Yet, a thorough analysis of these experimental situations within standard quantum mechanics is still lacking, and so it cannot be ruled out that a satisfactory and rigorous account will finally be found. As recent studies seem to indicate, the relevant tools are just about to be recognised: a formal representation of time observables and particle trajectories within quantum mechanics can indeed be given, namely in terms of positive operator valued measures (a.k.a. POVMs) (see, e.g., Muga *et al*, 2000). The uninitiated reader may find an elementary introduction in the recent review of the monograph of Busch *et al* (1995) by Fleming (2000).

The description of quantum observables as POVMs can be seen as a completion of the notion of observable within the Hilbert space framework of quantum mechanics, just as the description of quantum states as density operators constitutes a completion of the concept of states. In the latter case, the state vectors represent the set of pure states, the extremal elements of the full convex set of states, while in the former case, the traditional concept of observables is included in the form of projection valued measures (PVMs). It is quite conceivable that the extended (still standard) quantum language, which comprises all *effects*[2], whether projections or not, can be given a consistent realist interpretation of states and properties that incorporates ontic indeterminacy. Rather than following Home's interpretation of Heisenberg's potentiality concept in an epistemic sense, one may try to understand the tendency to actualisation in an ontic sense. That is to say, it may be possible to interpret the expression $\mathrm{tr}\,[\rho \cdot E]$, which is usually taken to be the probability for the occurrence of the outcome associated with the *effect* E if measured on a state ρ, as a measure of the degree of actualisation of the (sharp or unsharp) property represented by E.

It is probably true that the feasibility of such an individual, *unsharp (or fuzzy) reality* interpretation of quantum indeterminacy has not been sufficiently explored. But it seems to me that Home's argument that the inference from the uncertainty relation to the ontological indeterminateness of position and momentum, say, is not logically compelling has a counterpart aimed at a Bohmian interpretation of position as a definite property: Bohm's hidden variable theory is *contextual* in the sense that the measured values of (most) observables are

[2]I use this word in italic letters, to emphasise that it is a technical term. In a measurement scheme, every outcome is represented by an *effect*, which is determined as the unique operator whose expectation in each state gives the probability of that outcome. Technically *effects* are positive operators bounded between the zero and identity operators O and I. Operators E, F are ordered as $E \leq F$ iff $\langle\varphi|E\varphi\rangle \leq \langle\varphi|E\varphi\rangle$ for all vectors $\varphi \in \mathcal{H}$. An operator E is bounded between O and I iff $O \leq E \leq I$.

bound to differ from the possessed premeasurement values of the corresponding physical quantities. Hence there is no compelling reason to *assume* that positions have definite values; and one may wonder what is gained by telling stories about a physical system if what the stories tell is beyond experimental control. One may add that the standard use of quantum mechanics alone, without any recourse to hidden variables, has resulted in highly sophisticated technologies enabling the control of and experimentation with single micro-objects.

In discussing the interpretation of the uncertainty relations, Home points out rightly that the variances of position and momentum in a quantum state bear no logical connection with the measurement errors occurring in simultaneous measurements of these quantities. Such a connection seems to be suggested by Heisenberg in various semi-classical *Gedanken* experiments. A clarification of the question as to whether a measurement uncertainty relation holds necessarily for position and momentum had long been hampered due to the fact that no formal conception of joint measurements for noncommuting quantities was available. However, there do exist formal schemes for *approximate* measurements of position and momentum, and if the corresponding measurement couplings between the object system and two probes are activated simultaneously, then the resulting measurement scheme does constitute a joint approximate measurement of position and momentum; and it turns out that however small the position and momentum imprecisions are when the measurements are applied separately, the joint coupling of both probes results in a readjustment of the individual measurement imprecisions in such a way that they satisfy an uncertainty relation. Furthermore, it follows within these models that upon obtaining a phase space 'point' reading, (x, p), the quantum particle will be found afterwards in a state in which position and momentum are *unsharply* localised at that point, in the sense that the centers and variances of its position and momentum wave packets are equal to the values x, p, and the measurement imprecisions δx, δp, respectively. Details of this rigorous 'measurement imprecision' version of an uncertainty relation can be found in Sec. VI. of (Busch et al, 1995), where it is also shown that a convenient description of the measured joint position-momentum observable can be given in terms of POVMs on phase space in such a way that the measurement imprecision relation is automatically built in. The above (tentative) indeterminacy interpretation of quantum uncertainties is thus found to establish consistency between the possibilities of definition (preparation of position and momentum values) and the possibilities of determination (joint measurement of these quantities): what cannot be prepared better than allowed by the preparation uncertainty relation cannot be measured more precisely than allowed by the measurement imprecision relation.

These considerations are intended to show that the development of a mathematical theory of measurement and of observables represented as POVMs, that took place alongside, and largely unnoticed by, mainstream theoretical physicists, has opened up wider perspectives on some long-standing conceptual issues and offered new possibilities of dealing with them. In particular there is a well-developed theory of approximate joint measurements of noncommuting quantities which permits the analysis and interpretation of a variety of modern

quantum optical and atomic interferometric experiments and also guides the inception of new experiments. Some important relevant contributions emphasising conceptual issues are (de Muynck and Martens, 1990), (Appleby, 1998); for a more extensive bibliography, cf. (Busch *et al*, 1995).

While Home has demonstrated nicely in Chapter 1 that there *is* scope for going beyond the standard interpretation, the points raised above seem to show that this may even be true in a sense not anticipated in the present book. Besides the attempts to restore elements of a classical physical ontology along the lines of the Bohmian model, there is, I believe, the option of trying to develop a coherent 'quantum ontology'; an emphatic advocate of this route and of the ensuing need to develop and train appropriate quantum intuitions and ways of thinking is J.-M. Lévy-Leblond whose pleas for a progressive approach in incorporating novel theoretical physical structures into our thinking about the world are as mind-refreshing to read now as they were when they appeared (e.g., Lévy-Leblond, 1974, Lévy-Leblond, 1981; Lévy-Leblond and Balibar, 1990). I agree with Home when he says that any approach will need to be tested against its merits in dealing with the fundamental conceptual problems of quantum mechanics. In Chapter 2 he turns to the 'central riddle' of quantum mechanics: the quantum measurement paradox.

3 What is a measurement?

In a quantum mechanical account of measurement processes, the object system is brought into an interaction with an apparatus (or probe system) which establishes an entangled state for the compound system. Thus, the notion of a non-invasive measurement known from the realm of classical physics is no longer an admissible idealisation in quantum physics. Starting with this general observation, Home proceeds to sketch a variety of simple models in which the entanglement is shown to arise as a necessary consequence of the minimal requirement of a measurement to exhibit the eigenstates of the measured observable. There is no general reflection on the meaning of 'measurement' in view of the fact that a quantum measuring process cannot be said to reveal what is the case before the measurement, that is, to exhibit the premeasurement value. (A discussion of this point can be found in (Busch *et al*, 1991).) Hence we will adopt the minimal criterion suggested in Home's models, namely, that a measurement should exhibit with certainty which eigenstate the system was in, provided it was prepared in some eigenstate. We may refer to this requirement as the *calibration condition*. The linearity of quantum dynamics then leads to the result that for a superposition of eigenstates, the final state of system plus probe is a superposition of product states corresponding to different pointer states. Hence standard quantum mechanics does not seem to yield an account of the occurrence of a definite outcome, represented by the apparatus being found in one particular pointer state. This is the fundamental quantum measurement paradox. Home immediately flags two important related problems, namely, the question of the preferred pointer basis and the problem of explaining the ob-

jective reality of outcomes in terms of changes of properties of the macroscopic measuring device. The former is addressed by the decoherence theory, while the latter leads up to the classical limit problem treated in Chapter 3.

At this point it may be noted that the measurement paradox persists in the case of measurements described by POVMs (Busch and Shimony, 1996). While it can be expected that POVMs play a crucial róle in the description of macroscopic observables, there are indications that the conflict between the unitary quantum dynamics and the occurrence of definite outcomes will not disappear even if pointer observables are considered as unsharp quantities (Busch, 1998, Del Seta, 1998).

Interestingly, Home's first example of a measurement coupling is one that is purported to measure a continuous quantity, the position of a particle, where the calibration condition can be satisfied only approximately. This type of model is taken from von Neumann's book, and in the history of quantum mechanics it has found applications in manifold variations. One may therefore refer to it as *the standard model* of quantum measurement theory (Busch and Lahti, 1996). The essence of the model is that the initial product of object state (position amplitude $\psi(x)$) and probe state ($\phi_0(y)$) is unitarily transformed into a correlated state,

$$\Psi_0(x,y) = \psi(x)\phi_0(y) \;\longrightarrow\; \Psi(x,y) = \psi(x)\phi_0(y-x).$$

[Note: the summation sign in equation (2.1.12), p. 70 of the book under review, should be removed.] If the probe amplitude is sharply peaked at $y = 0$ initially, and if the object amplitude is sharply peaked at x_0, then the final probe amplitude will be sharply peaked at $y = x_0$. This is the approximate realisation of the calibration condition. It may be noted that the probability of finding the probe in some interval can be expressed as the expectation value of some positive operator in the initial object state. This operator is a kind of smeared version of a position spectral projection, and the family of all these operators associated with the various subsets of position space constitutes a POVM, representing the smeared position observable measured by this interaction. It is a bit ironic that the first-ever and fairly realistic measurement-theoretic model of a measurement is presented in the same book – von Neumann's! – that introduces the highly influential, and highly idealised notion of a perfect, repeatable measurement (of a discrete observable). The latter concept has in fact had a damaging effect in that it was long considered almost as synonymous with the term 'measurement', while the former model could have instantly led to the generalised notion of an observable represented as a POVM and opened up a realistic approach to quantum measurement. For example, as shown in (Busch and Lahti, 1996), this model lends itself most naturally to the development of a theory of joint position-momentum measurements, with the ensuing justification of the interpretation of the uncertainty relation in terms of individual measurement imprecision sketched in the preceding section.

The remaining part of Chapter 2 has three parts: a discussion of various standard solutions and their inadequacies, a review of nonstandard approaches,

and a section offering some original experimental examples devised to probe the relative merits of the nonstandard approaches. Among the standard solutions, Home distinguishes the viewpoints of Bohr and Heisenberg, the decoherence theory, and the Dirac-von Neumann projection postulate. A common aspect of these approaches is the (implicit or explicit) reference to the fact that the system (plus apparatus) is ultimately left in a mixture of states corresponding to the relevant pointer states. Indeed, Bohr's insistence on the need for a classical description of the measuring devices may be read as an anticipation of the necessity to explain that superpositions of macrosopically distinct (pointer) states are practically never observed. Also, Heisenberg's notion of the (necessary) 'cut' between object and device (observer) seems to allow a formalisation in terms of the partial trace operation over the device Hilbert space, which leaves the system in a mixed state; the mobility of the location of the cut allows one to perform the partial trace over the rest of the world beyond the device, which leaves the system plus device in a mixed state. The quotations given by Home make it apparent that Heisenberg considered these reduced density operators to practically admit a subjective ignorance interpretation, thereby anticipating the strategy of the decoherence approach. Decoherence theories finally argue that the system (plus apparatus) is left in the "appropriate" mixture due to the ubiquitous interactions between the device and its environment. Home stresses that it is our lacking an explanation of the transition from the pure to the mixed state that constitutes the measurement problem, and that reference to the practical impossibility, due to decoherence, of distinguishing the two types of description of the postmeasurement situation only constitutes a 'FAPP' solution.[3] Neither is a subjectivist, information theoretic account (Home refers to Heisenberg and Zeilinger) satisfactory, according to which the transition from the pure compound state to the mixture describes the change of knowledge of the observers. As Home points out, this view does not do justice to the fact that the change of knowledge is effected by a change in the real state of affairs that this knowledge refers to.

Here it is interesting to note that the book contains no explicit discussion of the two fundamentally different uses of mixed state ('density') operators: Home gives a lucid account (already in Chapter 1) of the use of density operators for the representation of statistical ensembles; however, the fact that these operators arise as descriptions of subsystems of compound systems emerges only rather implicitly at various points throughout the book. It is important to note that a pure entangled state of a compound system necessarily yields a mixed state description for each of its subsystems, and that these density operators of the subsystems do not allow an ignorance interpretation. A formal correlate to this is that every mixed state has an infinity of possible convex decompositions into (generally non-orthogonal) pure states, so that there is no *a priori* preference of a particular decomposition. These facts about state operators should be an integral part in the teaching of the quantum formalism; but instead they seem

[3] 'FAPP' is a famous acronym for 'for all practical purposes', coined by John Bell to characterise pragmatic attempts of dissolving fundamental quantum problems.

to be little known or noticed even in the expert literature. The readers of this book should therefore be encouraged to follow up the valuable references (10 and 11 of Chapter 1) given by Home.[4] A weakness of the decoherence account is that it does not recognise the need to address the fundamental nature of this distinction.

If the standard framework of quantum mechanics is unable to resolve the measurement problem, it follows that alterations, either of the formalism or of the interpretation, have to be taken into consideration. The nonstandard approaches considered at some length by Home are: the many-worlds interpretation, the Bohmian model, and the dynamical models of spontaneous 'wave function' (state vector) collapse. Very clear and valid critical assessments are given of the merits and difficulties of each of these approaches; in particular, some of the dynamical collapse models are presented in considerable technical and quantitative detail, in preparation for the subsequent exploration of possible experimental discriminations between these models, and the Bohmian model and the decoherence theoretical accounts.

At this point the reader may wonder whether it would be possible to give a systematic overview of the different interpretational options. I believe this question can be answered in the positive. If the standard rule of associating definite values with eigenstates is regarded as the root of the measurement problem, then this would suggest a systematic investigation of possible alternative interpretational rules specifying which quantities can be regarded as having definite values in relation to a given state. A comprehensive classification of such *no-collapse* interpretations has indeed been achieved in the recent book by J. Bub (1997), on the basis of a seminal paper by Bub and Clifton (1996). This work allows one to consider early and very different interpretations such as Bohr's and von Neumann's under a common perspective with the Bohmian model, the many-worlds and other more recent variants such as modal interpretations and consistent histories accounts. From the point of view of such a general analysis it becomes clear that the decoherence theory does not constitute a stand-alone approach to the measurement problem, unless it is supplemented with further interpretational commitments. In other words, decoherence is a physical phenomenon that plays a crucial part in the physics of macroscopic systems, and as such it figures in probably all no-collapse interpretations of quantum mechanics.

On the other hand, if one wishes to hold on to the eigenvalue-eigenstate rule, the only option left seems to be that of modifying the standard quantum formalism. There are basically two ways of removing the undesired superpositions of pointer states (or of more general macroscopically distinct states). The projection postulate, either in Dirac's stochastic quantum jump version or in von Neumann's collapse form can apparently be realised in two ways only:

[4]The mathematical feature of the non-unique convex decomposability of any mixed state was first observed as a general phenomenon by Schrödinger who was also fully aware of the interpretational implications (Schrödinger, 1936). A complete characterisation of the possible decompositions of a non-pure density operator has been given in (Hughston *et al*, 1993) for the finite-rank case, and in full generality in (Cassinelli *et al*, 1997) , based on a fundamental partial results of (Hadjisavvas, 1981).

either one modifies the dynamical law of quantum mechanics so that for isolated microsystems the Schrődinger equation is valid as a good approximation while for large systems a stochastic contribution in the generalised dynamical equations becomes predominant, leading to spontaneous destructions of coherent superpositions; or one makes room for the existence of superselection rules and the associated classical observables. But since these are known to emerge naturally only in the context of quantum systems with infinitely many degrees of freedom, the standard formalism of the Hilbert space quantum mechanics of finitely many particles would have to be extended to allow a modelling of macroscopic objects as infinite systems in an ontic sense. The extended framework is that of quantum field theory or its abstract version, C^*-algebraic quantum theory.

Home addresses only very briefly one version of the superselection rules approach, the many-Hilbert spaces theory. Therefore two supplementary remarks may be in place. A substantial philosophical assessment of the algebraic theory of superselection in relation to the quantum measurement problem can be found in (Landsman, 1995). The C^*-algebraic quantum formalism provides a natural framework for rigorous studies of decoherence as well as spontaneous dynamical collapse mechanisms, as indicated in recent work in the context of quantum filtering theory (Belavkin, 1994; Belavkin and Melsheimer, 1995).

The final topic of Home's chapter on measurement is a very interesting discussion of two experimental proposals. The first is a neutron interferometry experiment potentially capable of discriminating between decoherence effects and spontaneous wave function collapse models. Suitable variations of parameters in the various models show that environment-induced decoherence and spontaneous collapse lead to quantitatively different predictions regarding the occurrence or non-occurrence of observable interference effects. In the second, more tentative and less detailed, proposal, a DNA molecule is considered as a detection device to probe ultraviolet photon emission from a source. The mesoscopic nature of such macromolecules suggests that their functioning as quantum probes does not prevent them from assuming either one of their macroscopically distinct states rather than persisting in an entangled superposition state with the photon.

Home points out some quantitative difficulties met by the present decoherence and collapse models in an attempted explanation of such an experiment. In the case of the Bohm model, Home speculates that the ontological definiteness of position may allow the conclusion that interference effects of the – possibly overlapping – "wave functions" of the uv-damaged and undamaged DNA configurations are suppressed (unobservable). This would again demonstrate that 'within the Bohmian scheme, ontological position must be ascribed a more fundamental reality than the wave function' (p. 132). Home's main conclusion drawn from these examples is that experiments of the kind described here may provide useful hints for further refinements of the nonorthodox approaches.

Yet, while it is true that specific models of decoherence and spontaneous localisation, say, may lead to distinguishable experimental predictions, it is unclear whether an interpretation based on dynamical collapse can be experimentally

discriminated from the *no-collapse* interpretations. For in the latter it is just the *meaning* of the term 'objective reality' that has been changed; in fact, any no-collapse interpretation can adopt some form of stochastic dynamic model as an *effective* description of the state of affairs. It is thus an open question whether a change of interpretation (concept of reality) will suffice for a resolution of the measurement problem, or whether a change of theory (dynamics; superselection rules) is ultimately needed. At present, every researcher into this problem must be prepared to make a choice and a long-term commitment to one of these options and pursue its elaboration, without being able to know whether this will ultimately lead to its confirmation or refutation. The question to be answered by any no-collapse interpretation is whether it affords a coherent reformulation of the bulk of theoretical results of quantum physics in its own terms; in particular, it needs to provide a satisfactory account of the selection of its specific 'preferred' observable (Bub, 1997). The central task for the spontaneous collapse theorist is to go beyond the exploratory stage of *ad hoc* models and establish a general axiom of modified quantum dynamics that can be accepted as compelling and aesthetic as the unitary Schrődinger evolution has always been regarded to be.

The involvement of large objects in quantum measurements connects the measurement problem with the broader question of the classical limit of quantum mechanics. The nonstandard approaches discussed so far take for granted the universal validity of quantum mechanics or one of its modifications. Home refers to Leggett and ('even') Feynman as two distinguished authorities who pointed to the possibility that quantum mechanics could fail for large objects. The expectation is that before long experimental technology may have advanced far enough so as to allow us to test this possibility. Hence a good understanding of the relationships between the quantum and classical descriptions of macroscopic systems will be required. This is the subject of Chapter 3.

4 Is there a classical limit of quantum mechanics?

To begin with, I would like to cite another distinguished authority whose life work constitutes an essentially negative answer to this question. For the briefest summary of G. Ludwig's monumental studies of the quantum theory of macrosystems seems to be that quantum mechanics is not easily capable of providing the objective description appropriate to the behaviour of macrosystems. Ludwig concludes that a hierarchy of theories is needed to account for the whole range of phenomena from the microscopic to the macroscopic realms. In fact, in his approach the Hilbert space quantum mechanics of microsystems is first deduced from the objective description of macroscopic devices (Ludwig, 1985). The view that the extrapolation of quantum mechanics into a many-particle theory of macrosystems is a more comprehensive theory than the objective description of macrosystems has, according to Ludwig, 'generated unsurmountable

difficulties for explaining the measuring process'. Accordingly, his solution of the measurement problem is based on the construction of an objective theory of macrosystems that is more comprehensive than the extrapolated quantum mechanics (Ludwig, 1987). The compatibility between these two theories is expressed as the fact that approximate embedding maps between them can be formulated. Research along the lines of this programme is being pursued by the Marburg and Milan groups, e.g.,. (Lanz, 1994), (Lanz and Melsheimer, 1993)).

It is reassuring to observe that the general conclusions obtained from such a comprehensive *structural study* of the quantum-classical relationship are in agreement with the implications drawn from the very concrete *case studies* of classical limit procedures presented by Home. On reading his Chapter 3 it becomes evident that there are many strands to the classical limit problem, including the traditional semiclassical methods ($h \to 0$ limit, large quantum number limits, Ehrenfest's theorem) as well as the decoherence models and the Bohmian approach. In each case it is shown in detailed, explicit examples that certain classical features of large systems can approximately be described in terms of quantum mechanics; but it is also made clear that there remains room for genuine quantum effects in large systems. Thus there is scope for future experimental tests of this extrapolation of quantum mechanical predictions into the macroscopic realm. But Home points out that before any definite conclusions can be drawn, many more, and more realistic, case studies will have to be delivered within each of the approaches discussed.

Despite the unquestionable merit of this chapter as an introductory survey of the classical limit problem, it is crucial to point out that a whole range of important contributions (in addition to Ludwig's work) is left unnoticed. For example, the demand for more realistic modelling, including the development of a range of theoretical tools, had already been met to a significant degree in the case of the decoherence approach, by a book that appeared almost simultaneously with the present one: namely, (Giulini *et al*, 1996), reviewed in (Donald, 1999). Other contributions are concerned with the *structural* similarities and differences between quantum and classical mechanics, as opposed to the quantitative aspects considered in the present book. An excellent up-to-date exposition of mathematical aspects of quantisation theory can be found in (Landsman, 1998) (cf. the forthcoming review by G. Emch in this journal), while (Schroeck, 1996) (reviewed in (Landsman, 1999)) approaches the quantum-classical relationship from the point of view of quantum mechanics on phase space.

Home's analysis of the classical limit is centered on the following three *classicality* criteria: (1) the time evolution of a macroscopic system should (approximately) be describable in terms of a classical dynamical law (for its relevant state variables); (2) a macrosystem should be described as an object that is well localised at all times; (3) a macro-object can be measured non-invasively, that is, without affecting the outcomes of subsequent measurements. As regards, these criteria, one may wonder why only position should be required to have a definite value. The dynamics of a classical 'particle' is deterministic with respect to position and momentum taken together as the state variables, not with respect to position alone. Similarly, non-invasive measurability should be

stipulated to hold for *all* macroscopic quantities, not position alone. Hence one is forced to confront the fundamental structural difference between the quantum and classical description of a particle; the question to be asked is: how can the familiar deterministic phase space description of macroscopic classical particles be extracted from the quantum mechanical Hilbert space description? Attempts to resolve this problem have led to a variety of *phase space* formulations of quantum mechanics, ranging from the Wigner-Weyl formalism and Husimi distribution to geometric and other phase space quantisation schemes. Powerful mathematical and theoretical tools for the treatment of foundational as well as concrete quantum mechanical problems have been developed in these approaches, leading to valuable structural insights into the problem of quantum-classical compatibility. Yet, a coherent, generally accepted account of what exactly constitutes the classical limit of quantum mechanics is still lacking; and it may not be achieved without realistic case studies of macroscopic systems which make full use of the existing conceptual tools. In particular, such studies should make explicit the macroscopic nature of the systems, that is they should manifestly take into account the large number of degrees of freedom of these systems. Interesting approaches where 'macroscopic' is explicated using the tools of non-standard analysis (i.e., considering Planck's constant h as infinitesimal) have led to a structural transition from quantum to classical descriptions; (Werner and Wolff, 1995), (Ozawa, 1997).

In summary, to date the question whether Giulini et al or Ludwig is right – that is the question whether quantum mechanics does or does not suffice to explain the emergence of a classical world in the macrodomain – must be regarded as largely open: the starting points of these approaches are so different in their philosophical outlook and ensuing conceptual elaborations that a confrontation of their contrasting conclusions will require extensive further investigation. Examples of extensive recent studies complementing the material of Home's Chapter 3 are the books of Landsman (1998) and Schroeck (1996) mentioned above, as well as Stulpe (1997), which provide good starting points for a systematic treatment of these questions. A very surprising perspective on quantum mechanics, displaying its striking contrasts with classical mechanics in a novel way, has been discovered and developed during the 1990s by Beltrametti and Bugajski (e.g., Beltrametti and Bugajski, 1995), who introduced a classical extension of quantum mechanics in which quantum states are represented as mixed classical states and quantum *effects* are represented as fuzzy classical *effects*. This example shows that we should not expect that every possible way of confronting quantum mechanics with classical ontological ideas such as hidden variables has already been explored or even envisaged. The vast "distance" to be passed in the transition from quantum to the classical (or conversely) is strikingly illuminated in a philosophical case study of elementary particle tracks, which coincidentally enhances Ludwig's position regarding the necessity of a chain of theories linking the accounts of the microscopic with those of the macroscopic (Falkenburg, 1996).

5 Quantum nonlocality, superluminal signals, and all that

Chapter 4 on 'Quantum Nonlocality' provides a careful explanation of what constitutes a nonlocal effect. Home distinguishes between two types of nonlocality – kinematic and measurement-induced. The former kind is exemplified by the famous Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen experiment and is generically represented by pairs of spatially separated systems in entangled states. Home reviews the attempts to provide local realistic accounts of a variety of situations and the ensuing Bell-type inequalities or relations without inequalities, which are in conflict with both quantum mechanics as well as in some cases with actual experiments.

Interesting novel points discussed in great detail are the quantum mechanical predictions of violations of local realism even in the macroscopic limit and an experiment exhibiting nonlocality in single-photon states. Instances of measurement induced nonlocality arise in correlated, spatially separated systems if the collapse of the state vector is taken as an objective real process occurring in the individual case: this is nicely demonstrated in a model-independent example, thus reinforcing the notion of 'objectification at a distance' or 'passion at a distance' (Shimony, 1984). Other intriguing instances of this type of nonlocality involve negative-result measurements and the novel process of quantum teleportation (which since the publication of the book has been experimentally realised). Home emphasises that quantum nonlocality does not necessarily involve spacelike separations and thus relativistic considerations. Going somewhat beyond the scope of the book (nonrelativistic quantum mechanics), a brief discussion of the problem of spacelike nonlocalities and the ensuing 'danger' of superluminal signalling, and hence violations of relativistic causality, is given.

In this context, the issue of individual state determinations becomes crucial, which has been raised in various places in the book: the possibility of protective measurements, and the impossibility of state cloning (pp. 20-23). Home reviews the proposal that individual state determination would be feasible *if* it were possible to measure non-Hermitian operators with their non-orthogonal systems of eigenstates, and emphasises that this would enable superluminal signalling using EPR entangled systems. What seems to be lacking in the relevant literature is any attempt to develop a theory of measurements of such operators. It seems to me that the only conceivable route to making operational sense of such proposals is by way of the standard measurement formalism and the ensuing POVM approach. After all, the non-Hermitian operators in question are associated with a POVM in the same sense as a standard self-adjoint operator is associated with its spectral measure. There do exist general results to the extent that state cloning or other ways of discriminating non-orthogonal states using measurements involving POVMs are equally doomed to fail as was the case with standard observables (see, e.g., (Busch, 1997)).

If one enters the domain of relativistic quantum mechanics, the issue of nonlocality assumes an entirely new level of complexity: the definition of a local or nonlocal phenomenon must be based on a precise concept of *localised* processes

or operations; and the known ways of formalising localised states or localisation observables lead to implications that seem to be in conflict with relativistic causality. For recent reviews of the conceptual aspects involved, cf. (Butterfield and Fleming, 1999), and (Busch, 1999). Even the *definition* of (sharp, i.e. PVM) position observables for elementary systems is limited to the case of massive particles or massless particles of spin less than 1. It is only within the extended set of POVMs that a unified account of relativistic particle localisability can be achieved, namely, in terms of covariant phase space observables (e.g., (Schroeck, 1996), (Brooke and Schroeck, 1996)). In the current discussions of nonlocality, the localisation of the measurement operations involved is always tacitly assumed but apparently there is no attempt to make this assumption formally explicit. Hence a coherent account of these phenomena in terms of relativistic quantum theory is still waiting to be carried out. This becomes even more urgent in view of recent experimental demonstrations of (i) EPR-type nonlocality with entangled photons at distances of more than 10km (Zbinden *et al*, 2000) and (ii) photons tunnelling through opaque media with "superluminal" speeds (Cologne, 1998).

6 Complementarity *versus* Uncertainty?

In Chapter 5, Home discusses 'Wave particle duality of light and complementarity'. After a critical review of Bohr's views and some traditional early formalisations of the idea of complementarity, a variety of modern quantum optical experiments are described, concluding with the provocative suggestion that complementary wave and particle aspects can coexist, after all, possibly in some contrast to Bohr's intuitions. The chapter concludes with a careful examination of the empty-wave paradox as a difficulty of the Bohm and de Broglie causal theories. One may wonder whether a radical alternative approach to the whole issue would be to abandon the "wave" and "particle" terminology, along with undertaking a fundamental revision of the underlying ontology. It may be noted that conclusions similar in some sense to Home's, regarding the coexistence of information about path observables ("particle" properties?) and interference observables ("wave" properties?) have been obtained in measurement theoretic analyses of similar experiments. It is in fact possible to formalise the notion of a joint approximate measurement of such pairs of 'complementary' observables. The complementarity is then expressed in the reciprocal behaviour of the degrees of precision available at the same time (see, e.g., (Martens and de Muynck, 1990a,b), (de Muynck *et al*, 1991), (Busch *et al*, 1995)).

The idea of complementarity in quantum mechanics, however vague its descriptions by Bohr may have been regarded, has been a source of inspiration in the search for appropriate interpretations of quantum mechanics. This is well exemplified by Home's Chapter 5. Yet it is rather disturbing to see that various strands of important investigations have remained largely unnoticed. There have been confused debates about the logical relations between complementarity and uncertainty 'principles' ever since the quantum pioneers introduced these

notions. The style, and the conceptual and formal level of these discussions have advanced surprisingly little beyond the original works from the 1920s and 1930s. It is amazing to see that despite this conceptual obscurity, some very fascinating novel experimental realisations of former *Gedanken* experiments illustrating complementarity have been conceived and carried out. One recent example is an atomic interferometric demonstration of a link between complementarity and entanglement and of the fact that dynamic disturbances cannot (always) be made responsible for the destruction of interferences in 'which path' experiments (Dűrr *et al*, 1998). The controversy in the journal 'Nature' on 'complementarity *versus* uncertainty' leading up to this experiment (see the references in (Dűrr *et al*, 1998)) could probably have been cut short by taking into account existing relevant studies on the subject.

To begin with, 'complementarity' and 'uncertainty' are not (any more) 'principles' on which the presentation and teaching of quantum mechanics are (to be) based. They are more appropriately regarded as logical consequences of the formalism. As such, their logical relation cannot strictly speaking be investigated *within* the Hilbert space framework. Such an analysis requires a more general theoretical framework in which both ideas can be formulated as contingent postulates. Only then can the question be asked whether or not one implies the other, or whether or not they both have some common implications. Answers can be found in (Lahti, 1980; 1983). Next, uncertainty and complementarity can be understood as relations (between observables) within standard quantum mechanics; even then there are different possible formalisations. We have discussed the case of the uncertainty relations in an earlier section. Valuable studies of quantitative aspects of complementarity and uncertainty relations can be found in (Lahti, 1987), (Martens and de Muynck, 1990a,b), or (Uffink and Hilgevoord, 1985).

7 The Quantum Zeno effect and time as an observable

The last strictly physical chapter of the book deals with the quantum Zeno effect – the fact that under certain conditions the dynamical evolution of a quantum system can be inhibited by continuously observing it. For example, continuous monitoring of an unstable state may have the effect of 'freezing' the evolution altogether. This phenomenon is paradoxical if one ignores the fact that in quantum mechanics, and contrary to classical physics, measurements can *not* be regarded as non-invasive. Home reviews simple models of continuous observations of decaying systems where the effect depends on deviations from the exponential decay law in the short time range which are theoretically required but not yet experimentally exhibited. This is followed by a careful analysis of the famous 'quantum telegraph' experiment of Itano *et al*, showing that it demonstrates an interaction-induced – as opposed to measurement-induced – inhibition of transitions. Home then describes the status of a variety of ingenious

experimental proposals which can be expected to eventually lead to conclusive tests of the quantum Zeno effect.

The central practical difficulty is one of making rapid sequences of measurement, with an enormously high degree of temporal resolution, within the order of the lifetimes of the observed systems. Another, conceptual, issue not raised is the question as to whether a 'continuous observation' is adequately modelled as a rapid sequence of ordinary (von Neumann-Lűders) measurements. There may be a subtle but fundamental difference between the experimental approaches toward answering the two questions: 'Has the system decayed yet at time $t_n \in \{0, t_1, \ldots, t_N = T\}$?', and 'When did the system decay during the period $[0, T]$?' In the first case the answer will be sought by making a yes-no measurement of the simple observable $\{P_\psi, I - P_\psi\}$, where P_ψ is the projection onto the unstable initial state of the system. In the latter case the experiment consists of placing detectors around the system and *waiting* for its decay products to show up. This addresses the question about the time of the occurrence of an event, considered as an *event time observable*. A quantum theory of time measurements is largely still waiting to be developed, although the POVM approach has provided some promising modelling, primarily of photon counting processes in quantum optics. For a review, cf. (Srinivas and Vijayalakshmi, 1981), (Srinivas, 1996). Since the appearance of the present book, questions such as 'When does a measurement occur?', and 'When does a particle (decay product) pass a certain space region (detector)?' have become the subject of renewed intense interest in experimental and theoretical physics, leading to an increased awareness and appreciation of the deep open conceptual problems involved (Muga and Leavens, 2000).

8 Causality, reality, objectivity

The last two chapters are devoted to philosophical issues. Chapter 7 presents a discussion of the possible meanings of causality and its status in classical and quantum mechanics. An assessment is given of the various different ways in which the standard interpretation, the Bohmian model and the dynamical collapse theory attempt to cope with the apparent indeterminism of individual measurement outcomes. The attitude of the standard approach is characterised as a resignation to accept acausality at the individual level and to be content with the validity of causality at the statistical level (of the evolution of probabilities). By contrast, the Bohmian causal theory offers a way of restoring a manifest causal link between pre- and post-measurement situations – even if at the expense of having to acknowledge that this causal account is *inaccessible* to observation as a matter of principle. The dynamical collapse theories finally cast the indeterminism of stochastic jumps occurring in any measurement into the form of a law, thus providing a logical basis for the concept of statistical causality. The tensions with relativistic causality faced by the latter two approaches are briefly explained, noting that both of them have their ways of evading causal paradoxes, either by accepting a preferred frame of reference or

by careful selection of the collapse dynamics, respectively.

The *róle* of the concept of causality in the complex process of *constituting objective experience* is not addressed. Home comes close to such a consideration in the final chapter where he offers a reappraisal of Einstein's case for realism. On the basis of a number of carefully selected and well placed quotations from Einstein and his contemporaries, Home describes Einstein's turn from his early positivistic preferences to his ultimate advocacy of *local, causal realism*. In trying to exhibit Einstein's motivation for his strict adherence to locality, Home makes the following key observation (pp. 367-368): 'Einstein's point was not that nonlocal actions are inconceivable but that their existence undermines physical science. If distant nonlocal influences are permitted, then unless these are eliminated ..., we cannot trust measurement results to indicate that a system is in a specific state, possesses specific properties, and so on... Thus Einstein believed that the locality condition was necessary to ensure the existence of closed systems and therefore the possibility of testing theories:

> if this axiom were to be completely abolished, the idea of the existence of (quasi) enclosed systems, and thereby the postulation of laws, which can be checked empirically in the accepted sense would become impossible.

Note that the primary motivation behind Einstein locality is not the relativistic requirement that no signal may propagate faster than light but rather a more general consideration related to a fundamental methodological principle of physical science.'

Home here touches upon an issue that is central to one particular approach towards reconstructing quantum theory: the Cologne version of 'quantum logic'. Quantum logic was initiated by von Neumann and Birkhoff who analysed the proposition structure entailed by the lattice of subspaces of Hilbert space. Various researchers considered quantum logic as a revision of classical logic which allowed one to maintain the value definiteness of propositions without running into the contradictions that classical logical rules would otherwise lead to. Later it was realised that the *aprioristic* structures of logic could be recovered by a transcendental philosophical argumentation much in the same way as was carried out by Kant for epistemological categories such as substance and causality. This led to a reconstruction of the quantum language via a reflection on necessary conditions of the accepted form of a scientific language about *object*-ive scientific experience. A convenient form for this programme was provided by the theory of dialogue games (Mittelstaedt, 1978), (Stachow, 1980). Moreover, it has been possible to exhibit specific features of the quantum mechanical proposition lattice – atomicity and covering law – as consequences of the condition that this language refers to *individual* objects (Stachow, 1985).

On the formal side, a central aim of the quantum logics approach was the derivation of the Hilbert space realisation of the proposition lattice from physically motivated assumptions. In fact, as is well known, any irreducible orthocomplemented, orthomodular lattice of chain length greater than 3 can be identified with a (sublattice of a) lattice of subspaces of some orthomodular vector

space, in such a way that the associated bilinear form of that space determines the orthogonality relation. The construction of the isomorphic embedding in question fixes uniquely the skew field over which the vector space is defined. It was long believed that the only candidate fields for which this construction worked are the 'classical' fields of the real or complex numbers, or the quaternions. However, in 1980, examples of 'non-classical' orthomodular vector spaces were discovered, and the whole quantum logic programme stalled for about 15 years as it was not clear whether a lattice theoretic property could be formulated that would select the 'classical' fields. Such a condition was indeed found in the mid-1990s, leaving still open the problem of a physical motivation. For a survey of this development, cf. (Holland, 1995).

The idea of deducing quantum structures from conditions of objective experience suggests a thorough revision of the Kantian programme in order to examine whether this approach can be appropriately adapted so as to encompass modern physical theories. Such a project would not only examine the role of properties such as locality in the constitution of objects but would include all other categories originally proposed by Kant, including causality. The first steps into this major philosophical enterprise have been taken within the Cologne group (Mittelstaedt, 1986), (Strohmeyer,1987, 1995), but much work remains to be done, particularly in exhibiting the implications of the philosophical findings for the interpretation of quantum mechanics. At the present stage, I feel, there is room to hope that a quantum ontology can be formulated which gives a framework for a viable alternative to the Bohmian model, namely, in the form of a coherent 'indeterminacy', or 'unsharp reality', interpretation of quantum mechanics as a theory of individual objects (Busch et al, 1995), (Mittelstaedt, 1995).

Acknowledgement 1 *My sincere thanks go to Marcus Appleby, James Brooke, Jeremy Butterfield, and Chris Shilladay for their critical (proof)reading and/or numerous valuable comments and suggestions on a draft version of this work.*

References

Appleby, D.M. (1998) 'Concept of experimental accuracy and simultaneous measurements of position and momentum' *International Journal of Theoretical Physics* **37**, 1491-1509.

Belavkin, V.P. (1994) 'Nondemolition Principle of Quantum Measurement Theory', *Foundations of Physics* **24**, 685-714.

Belavkin, V.P., and Melsheimer, O. (1995) 'A Hamiltonian Solution to Quantum Collapse, State Diffusion and Spontaneous Localisation', in *Quantum Communications and Measurement*, eds. V.P. Belavkin, O. Hirota, and R.L. Hudson (New York: Plenum), pp.201-222.

Beltrametti, E., and Bugajski, S. (1995) 'A classical extension of quantum mechanics', *Journal of Physics* **A28**, 3329-3343.

Bohm, D., and Hiley, B.J. *The Undivided Universe: An Ontological Interpretation of Quantum Theory* (London: Routledge).

Brooke, J.A., and Schroeck, F.E. (1996) 'Localization of the photon on phase space', *Journal of Mathematical Physics* **37**, 5958-5986.
Bub, J. (1997) *Interpreting the Quantum World* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
Bub, J., and Clifton, R. (1996) 'A Uniqueness Theorem for "No Collapse" Interpretations of Quantum Mechanics', *Studies in History and Philosophy of Modern Physics* **27B**, 181-219.
Busch, P. (1985) 'Indeterminacy Relations and Simultaneous Measurements in Quantum Theory', *International Journal of Theoretical Physics* **24**, 63-92.
Busch, P. (1997) 'Is the quantum state (an) observable?', in *Potentiality, Entanglement and Passion-at-a-Distance*, Boston Studies in the Philosophy of Science, Vol 194 (Boston: Kluwer).
Busch, P. (1998) 'Can 'unsharp objectification' solve the quantum measurement problem?', *International Journal of Theoretical Physics* **37**, 241-247.
Busch, P. (1999) 'Unsharp localization and causality in relativistic quantum theory', *Journal of Physics A* **32**, 6535-6546.
Busch, P., Grabowski, M. and Lahti, P. (1995) *Operational Quantum Physics* (Berlin: Springer), 2nd printing 1997.
Busch, P., and Lahti, P. (1996) 'The Standard Model of Quantum Measurement Theory: History and Applications', *Foundations of Physics* **26**, 875-983.
Busch, P., Lahti, P., and Mittelstaedt, P. (1991) *The Quantum Theory of Measurement* (Berlin: Springer), 2nd revised edition 1996.
Busch, P., and Shimony, A. (1996) 'Insolubility of the Quantum Measurement Problem for Unsharp Observables', *Studies in History and Philosophy of Modern Physics* **27B**, 397-404.
Butterfield, J., and Fleming, G.N. (1999) 'Strange Positions', in *From Physics to Philosophy*, eds. J. Butterfield and C. Pagonis (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
Cassinelli, G., De Vito, E., and Levrero, A. (1997) 'On the decompositions of a quantum state', *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*, **210**, 472-483.
Cologne (1998) *Superluminal(?) Velocities: Tunneling time, barrier penetration, non-trivial vacua, philosophy of physics*, Proceedings, Cologne, June 1998, *Annalen der Physik* **7**, 585-788.
Del Seta, M. (1998) *Quantum Measurement as Theory: Its Structure and Problems*, PhD Thesis, London School of Economics and Political Science.
De Muynck, W.M., and Martens, H. (1990) 'Neutron Interferometry and the Joint Measurement of Incompatible Observables', *Physical Review A* **42**, 5079-5085.
De Muynck, W.M., Stoffels, W.W., and Martens, H. (1991) 'Joint Measurement of Interference and Path Observables in Optics and Neutron Interferometry', *Physica* **B 175**, 127-132.
Donald, M.J. (1999) 'Book Review: Decoherence and the Appearance of a Classical World in Quantum Theory', *Studies in History and Philosophy of Modern Physics* **30B**, 437-441.

Dűrr, W., Nonn, T., and Rempe, G. (1998) 'Origin of quantum-mechanical complementarity probed by a 'which-way' experiment in an atom interferometer', *Nature* **395 (3)**, 33-37.
Falkenburg, B. (1996) 'The Analysis of Particle Tracks: A Case for Trust in the Unity of Physics', *Studies in History and Philosophy of Modern Physics* **27B**, 337-371.
Fleming, G.N. (2000) 'Essay Review: Operational Quantum Physics', *Studies in History and Philosophy of Modern Physics* **31B**, 117-125.
Giulini, D., Joos, E., Kiefer, C., Kupsch, J., Stamatescu, I.-O., and Zeh, H.D. (1996) *Decoherence and the Appearance of a Classical World in Quantum Theory* (Berlin: Springer).
Hadjisavvas, N. (1981) 'Properties of mixtures of non-orthogonal states' *Letters on Mathematical Physics* **5**, 327-332.
Holland, P.R. (1993) *The Quantum Theory of Motion – An Account of the de Broglie-Bohm Causal Interpretation of Quantum Mechanics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
Holland, S.S. (1995) 'Orthomodularity in infinite dimensions; a theorem of M. Solèr', *Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society* **32**, 205-234.
Hughston, L.P., Josza, R., and Wootters, W.K. (1993) 'A complete classification of quantum ensembles having a given density matrix', *Physics Letters A* **183**, 14-18.
Lahti, P. (1980) 'Uncertainty and complementarity in axiomatic quantum mechanics', *International Journal of Theoretical Physics* **19**, 789-842.
Lahti, P. (1983) 'Hilbertian quantum theory as the theory of complementarity', *International Journal of Theoretical Physics* **22**, 911-929.
Lahti, P. (1987) 'Complementarity and uncertainty: some measurement-theoretical and information-theoretical aspects', in *Symposium on the Foundations of Modern Physics 1997*, eds. P. Lahti and P. Mittelstaedt, pp. 181-208 (Singapore: World Scientific).
Landsman, N.P. (1995) 'Observation and Superselection in Quantum Mechanics', *Studies in History and Philosophy of Modern Physics* **26B**, 45-73.
Landsman, N.P. (1998) *Mathematical topics between classical and quantum mechanics* (New York: Springer).
Landsman, N.P. (1999) 'Essay Review: Quantum Mechanics on Phase Space', *Studies in History and Philosophy of Modern Physics* **30B**, 282-305.
Lanz, L.(1994) 'Quantum Physics and Objective Description', *International Journal of Theoretical Physics* **33**, 19-29.
Lanz, L., and Melsheimer, O. (1993) 'Towards an Objective Quantum Physics', *Nuovo Cimento B* **108**, 511-539.
Lévy-Leblond, J.-M. (1974) 'The Pedagogical Role and Epistemological Significance of Group Theory in Quantum Mechanics', *Rivista del Nuovo Cimento* **4**, 99-143.
Lévy-Leblond, J.-M. (1981) 'Classical apples and quantum potatoes', *European Journal of Physics* **2**, 44-47.
Lévy-Leblond, J.-M., and Balibar, F. (1990) *Quantics – Rudiments of Quantum Physics* (Amsterdam: North-Holland).

Ludwig, G. (1985) *An Axiomatic Basis for Quantum Mechanics, Vol 1: Derivation of Hilbert Space Structure* (Berlin: Springer).
Ludwig, G. (1987) *An Axiomatic Basis for Quantum Mechanics, Vol 2: Quantum Mechanics and Macrosystems* (Berlin: Springer).
Martens, H., and de Muynck, W.M. (1990a) 'Nonideal Quantum Measurements', *Foundations of Physics* **20**, 255-281.
Martens, H., and de Muynck, W.M. (1990b) 'The Inaccuracy Principle', *Foundations of Physics* **20**, 357-380.
Mittelstaedt, P. (1978) *Quantum Logic* (Dordrecht: Reidel).
Mittelstaedt, P. (1986) *Sprache und Realität in der modernen Physik* (Mannheim: Bibliographisches Institut).
Mittelstaedt, P. (1995) 'Constitution of Objects in Classical Mechanics and in Quantum Mechanics', *International Journal of Theoretical Physics* **34**, 1615-1626.
Muga J.G., and Leavens, C.R. (2000) 'Arrival Time in Quantum Mechanics', *Physics Reports*, to appear.
Ozawa, M. (1997) 'Phase Operator problem and macroscopic extension of quantum mechanics', *Annals of Physics* **257**, 65-83.
Peres, A. (1993) *Quantum Theory: Concepts and Methods* (Dordrecht: Kluwer).
Schrödinger, E. (1936) 'Probability relations between separated systems', *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philosphical Society* **32**, 446-452.
Schroeck, F.E. (1996) *Quantum Mechanics on Phase Space* (Dordrecht: Kluwer).
Srinivas, M.D., and Vijayalakshmi, R. (1981) 'The Time of Occurrence in Quantum Mechanics', *Pramana* **16**, 173-199.
Srinivas, M.D. (1996) 'Quantum theory of continuous measurements and its applications in quantum optics', *Pramana* **47**, 1-23.
Stachow, E.W. (1980) 'Logical Foundations of Quantum Mechanics', *International Journal of Theoretical Physics* **19**, 251-304.
Stachow, E.W. (1985) 'Structures of Quantum Language for Individual Systems', in *Recent Developments in Quantum Logic*, eds. P. Mittelstaedt and E.W. Stachow (Mannheim: Bibliographisches Institut).
Strohmeyer, I. (1987) 'Tragweite und Grenzen der Transzendentalphilosophie zur Grundlegung der Quantenphysik', *Zeitschrift fűr allgemeine Wissenschaftstheorie* **18/1-2**.
Strohmeyer, I. (1995) *Quantentheorie und Transzendentalphilosophie* (Heidelberg: Spektrum Akademischer Verlag).
Stulpe, W. (1997) *Classical Representations of Quantum Mechanics* (Berlin: Wissenschaft und Technik).
Uffink, J.B.M., and Hilgevoord, J. (1985) 'Uncertainty Principle and Uncertainty Relations' *Foundations of Physics* **15**, 925-944.
Werner, R.F., and Wolff, M.P.H. (1995) 'Classical Mechanics as Quantum Mechanics with Infinitesimal h', *Physics Letters A* **202**, 155-159.
Zapp, H. Chr. (1978) *Die Spinbatterie – ein Beitrag zur quantenmechanischen Theorie des Messprozesses,* Diplomarbeit, Institute for Theoretical Physics, University of Kiel, 1978.

Zbinden, H., Brendel, J., Gisin, N., and Tittel, W. (2000) 'Experimental test of non-local quantum correlations in relativistic configurations', arXiv:quant-ph/0007009.